UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,674	02/25/2004	Marc Shapiro	305378.01	3021

22971 7590 05/03/2007		

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/03/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com
a-rydore@microsoft.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/786,674	SHAPIRO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay A. Morrison	2168	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13-18,21-24,35,36 and 43-56* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13-18,21-24,35,36 and 43-56* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *12,19,20,25,26,57 and 58* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   Claims 1-26,35-36,43-58 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/18/07

has been entered.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

   a.   As per claim 5, line 4: "secion action" should be "second action".

   b.   As per claim 35, line 4: "applicationa" should be "application".

Appropriate correction is required.

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   Claims 12,19-20,25-26,57-58 are objected to as being dependent upon a

rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the identified relationship" in line 16. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination

it is assumed the Applicant meant "identified cross-source relationship".

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the second" in line 2. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is

assumed the Applicant meant "the second action".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7.   Claims 1-11,13-18,21-24,35-36,43-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Meno et al. ('De Meno' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,721,767) in view of Duparcmeur et al. ('Duparcmeur' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,633,869).

        As per claim 1, De Meno teaches

        A computer implemented method comprising: (see abstract and background)
        recording action information pertaining to a first action executed in a first computer application; (application specific rollback, column 3, lines 45-55)
        the first computer application being a different computer application from the second computer application; (different applications, column 3, lines 42-45)
        executing a first action management operation on the first action; (application store information X, column 3, lines 56-59)

and outputting a result corresponding to executing the first action management

operation or the second action management operation. (changes tracked and displayed,

column 5, lines 50-54)

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "identifying a cross-source relationship

between the first action and a second action executed in a second computer

application" or "responsive to executing the first action management operation,

executing a second action management operation on the second action based on the

identified relationship".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "identifying a cross-source relationship between

the first action and a second action executed in a second computer application" (relation

between first and second entity, column 4, lines 12-16), "responsive to executing the

first action management operation, executing a second action management operation

on the second action based on the identified relationship" (action performed on second

object in response to action performed on first object, column 4, lines 20-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of

"identifying a cross-source relationship between the first action and a second action

executed in a second computer application" and "responsive to executing the first action

management operation, executing a second action management operation on the

second action based on the identified relationship" would have given those skilled in the

art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This

gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 2,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "the cross-source relationship includes a predecessor-successor relationship between the first action and the second action".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "the cross-source relationship includes a predecessor-successor relationship between the first action and the second action" (column 6, lines 17-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "the cross-source relationship includes a predecessor-successor relationship between the first action and the second action" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 3,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "execution of the second action is dependent on the execution of the first action".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "execution of the second action is dependent on the execution of the first action" (column 6, lines 42-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "execution of the second action is dependent on the execution of the first action" would

have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining

integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to

interact.

As per claim 4,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "wherein the first action is a different action

from the second and the second action is not executed if the first action is not

executed".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "wherein the first action is a different action from

the second and the second action is not executed if the first action is not executed"

(column 6, lines 42-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of

"wherein the first action is a different action from the second and the second action is

not executed if the first action is not executed" would have given those skilled in the art

the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This

gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 5, De Meno teaches

the first action is a different action from the second action and execution of the

first action generates results that are different from results generated by execution of

the second action. (column 3, lines 40-45)

As per claim 6, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

execution of the first action generates a first result of the first computer

application and executing the first action management operation includes modifying the

first result of the first action. (column 4, lines 1-5)

As per claim 7, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

execution of the second action generates a second result of the second

computer application and executing the second action management operation includes

modifying the second result of the second action. (column 4, lines 1-5)

As per claim 8, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

the first action management operation includes one of undoing, redoing, or fixing.

(column 4, lines 1-2)

As per claim 9, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

the first action management operation includes undoing the first action and rolling

back the first result. (column 4, lines 1-5)

As per claim 10, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

the second action management operation includes the second action, and

wherein undoing the second action includes rolling back the second result. (column 4,

lines 1-5)

As per claim 11, De Meno teaches

the second action is a different action from the first action. (column 3, lines 40-

45)

As per claim 13, De Meno teaches

the second application is inactive and executing the second action management

operation includes: (column 4, lines 37-40)

activating the second application; (column 4, lines 40-45)

and accessing the second action management operation on the second action

based on the activating. (column 4, lines 40-45)

As per claim 14,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "the cross-source relationship includes an

atomic parcel relationship between the first action and the second action".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "the cross-source relationship includes an

atomic parcel relationship between the first action and the second action" (column 6,

lines 32-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "the cross-source relationship includes an atomic parcel relationship between the first action and the second action" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 15, De Meno teaches

executing the first action management operation includes: displaying a plurality of first computer application actions executed in the first computer application, wherein the plurality of first computer application actions includes the first action; (column 5, lines 43-46; figure 4)

receiving a selection of the first action in the plurality of first computer application actions; (column 5, lines 54-60; figure 4)

and executing the first action management operation on the selected first action. (column 5, lines 54-60; figure 4)

As per claim 16,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "identifying the cross-source relationship includes receiving a related action identifier from the first computer application, the related action identifier indicating the cross-source relationship between the first action and the second action".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "identifying the cross-source relationship includes receiving a related action identifier from the first computer application, the related action identifier indicating the cross-source relationship between the first action and the second action" (column 6, lines 17-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "identifying the cross-source relationship includes receiving a related action identifier from the first computer application, the related action identifier indicating the cross-source relationship between the first action and the second action" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 17, De Meno teaches

the first action, the second action, the action management operation, and the second management operation are executed by a single user. (column 3, lines 60-65)

As per claim 18, De Meno teaches

A computer readable storage medium encoding a computer program for executing on a computer system a computer process, the computer process comprising: (see abstract and background)

recording action information pertaining to an action of the first computer-related source; (application specific rollback, column 3, lines 45-55)

recording a related action identifier corresponding to the action of the first

computer-related source, (application stores information X, column 3, lines 55-60)

the related action identifier for indicating an associated relationship with a

recorded action of a second computer-related source, the first computer-related source

being a different computer-related source from the second computer-related source;

('for' indicates intended use; Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d

1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method

claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step

positively recited." Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise

a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or

"adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore

intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C),

MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

displaying the action information including the action of the first computer-related

source and at least one action management operation; (user lists detailed

backup/change dates, column 5, lines 50-55)

receiving a selection of the action of the first computer-related source and the at

least one action management operation; (user retrieves desired action, column 5, lines

53-58)

executing the selected at least one action management operation on the selected

action of the first computer-related source; (user open file of interest, column 5, lines

65-67)

and outputting a result corresponding to executing the selected at least one

action management operation on the selected action of the first computer-related

source or on the recorded action of the second computer-related source. (changes

tracked and displayed, column 5, lines 50-54)

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "executing the selected at least one action

management operation on the recorded action of the second computer-related source

based on the associated relationship".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "executing the selected at least one action

management operation on the recorded action of the second computer-related source

based on the associated relationship" (action performed on second object in response

to action performed on first object, column 4, lines 20-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of

"executing the selected at least one action management operation on the recorded

action of the second computer-related source based on the associated relationship"

would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by

maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing

objects to interact.

As per claim 21, De Meno teaches

the first computer-related source comprises a first computer application and the

second computer-related source comprises a second computer application, the first

computer application being a different computer application from a the second computer

application. (different applications, column 3, lines 40-45)

As per claim 22, De Meno teaches

the second computer application is inactive and wherein executing the selected

at least one action management operation on the recorded action of the second

computer-related source comprises: (column 4, lines 37-40)

activating the second computer application; (column 4, lines 40-45)

and executing the selected at least one action management operation on the

recorded action of the activated second computer application. (column 4, lines 40-45)

As per claim 23, De Meno teaches

recording action information pertaining to an action of the first computer-related

source comprises: (column 5, lines 43-46; figure 4)

receiving a first log of actions from the first computer application, the first log of

actions including actions executed on the first computer application; (column 5, lines 54-

60; figure 4)

and receiving a second log of actions from the second computer application, the

second log of actions including actions executed on the second computer application.

(column 5, lines 54-60; figure 4)

As per claim 24, De Meno teaches

recording a related action identifier includes receiving the related action identifier

from the first computer application. (column 3, lines 55-60)

As per claim 35, De Meno teaches

A system comprising: (see abstract and background)

a memory including: (computer system, column 2, lines 65-67)

a first application program; (different applications, column 3, lines 40-45)

a second application program, the second application program being a different

application program from the first application program; (different applications, column 3,

lines 40-45)

an action management module including: (module, column 3, lines 50-52)

an action log containing an action identifier identifying a first action executed by

the first application (rollback software generates index, column 3, lines 53-57)

a processor for executing the first application program, the second application

program, and the action management module; (computer system, column 2, lines 65-

67)

and an input interface for receiving a command input, wherein, responsive to the

input interface receiving the command input, the action management module executes

an operation on the first action. (lists files, receives input, file retrieved, column 5, lines

40-65)

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "and a corresponding related action

identifier identifying a second action executed by the second application program, the

first action and the second action being related by a cross-source relationship", or

"identifies the second action based on the cross-source relationship, and, based on the

execution of the operation on the first action, executes the operation on the second

action".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "and a corresponding related action identifier

identifying a second action executed by the second application program, the first action

and the second action being related by a cross-source relationship" (relation between

first and second entity, column 4, lines 12-16), or "identifies the second action based on

the cross-source relationship, and, based on the execution of the operation on the first

action, executes the operation on the second action" (action performed on second

object in response to action performed on first object, column 4, lines 20-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of

"and a corresponding related action identifier identifying a second action executed by

the second application program, the first action and the second action being related by

a cross-source relationship", and "identifies the second action based on the cross-

source relationship, and, based on the execution of the operation on the first action,

executes the operation on the second action" would have given those skilled in the art

the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This

gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 36, De Meno teaches

A method comprising: (see abstract and background)

receiving first input commands from a user; (different applications, column 3,

lines 43-45; user determines necessary document usage, column 3, lines 63-66)

executing a first sequence of actions in a first computer application responsive to

the first input commands; (store information X at time T1, column 3, lines 55-60)

receiving second input commands from the user; (different applications, column

3, lines 43-45; user determines necessary document usage, column 3, lines 63-66)

executing a second sequence of actions in a second computer application

responsive to the second input commands, the second computer application being a

different computer application from the first computer application; (store information X at

time T1, column 3, lines 55-60)

generating a first action log indicating the first sequence of actions and a second

action log indicating the second sequence of actions; (application specific rollback

application generates index, column 3, lines 50-55)

receiving a selection from the user of an action, the action selected by the user

being selected from the first action log; (user retrieves desired action, column 5, lines

53-58)

receiving a third input from the user (user presses open button, column 5, lines

65-66)

for executing an operation on the selected action from the first action log; ('for'

indicates intended use; Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d

1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method

claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step

positively recited." Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise

a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or

"adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore

intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C),

MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

executing the operation on the selected action from the first action log based on

the third input; (user open file of interest, column 5, lines 65-67)

and outputting results corresponding to execution of the operation on the

selected action from the first action log or the action from the second action log.

(changes tracked and displayed, column 5, lines 50-54)

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "identifying a cross-source relationship

between the action selected by the user from the first action log and an action in the

second action log" or "responsive to identifying the cross-source relationship, executing

the operation on the identified action from the second action log".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "identifying a cross-source relationship between

the action selected by the user from the first action log and an action in the second

action log" (relation between first and second entity, column 4, lines 12-16), "responsive

to identifying the cross-source relationship, executing the operation on the identified

action from the second action log" (action performed on second object in response to

action performed on first object, column 4, lines 20-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "identifying a cross-source relationship between the action selected by the user from the first action log and an action in the second action log" and "responsive to identifying the cross-source relationship, executing the operation on the identified action from the second action log" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 43, De Meno teaches

A computer-readable medium storing a data structure comprising: (see abstract and background)

an action identifier identifying a primary action stored within a first data field, the primary action including an executed action by a first computer-related source; (application specific rollback information, column 3, lines 45-55)

a source identifier stored within a second data field and identifying the first computer-related source associated with the action identifier, the source identifier being stored within the second data field; (rollback software index, column 3, lines 50-53)

a source identifier stored within a fourth data field and identifying a second computer-related source associated with the related action identifier. (application specific rollback information, column 3, lines 45-55)

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "a related action identifier stored within a third data field and identifying a secondary action related to the primary action, the secondary action being executed by a second computer-related source, the second computer-related source being a different computer-related source from the first computer-related source".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "a related action identifier stored within a third data field and identifying a secondary action related to the primary action, the secondary action being executed by a second computer-related source, the second computer-related source being a different computer-related source from the first computer-related source" (relationship patterns, column 6, lines 32-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "a related action identifier stored within a third data field and identifying a secondary action related to the primary action, the secondary action being executed by a second computer-related source, the second computer-related source being a different computer-related source from the first computer-related source" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 44,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "the data structure further comprises: a relationship descriptor stored in a fifth data field and specifying the relationship between the primary action and the secondary action".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "the data structure further comprises: a relationship descriptor stored in a fifth data field and specifying the relationship between the primary action and the secondary action" (relation between first and second entity, column 4, lines 12-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "the data structure further comprises: a relationship descriptor stored in a fifth data field and specifying the relationship between the primary action and the secondary action" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 45,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "the data structure further comprises: a container action identifier stored in a fifth data field and identifying a container action containing the primary action within an action hierarchy".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "the data structure further comprises: a container action identifier stored in a fifth data field and identifying a container action containing the primary action within an action hierarchy" (column 6, lines 32-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "the data structure further comprises: a container action identifier stored in a fifth data field and identifying a container action containing the primary action within an action hierarchy" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 46,

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "the data structure further comprises: a component action identifier stored in a fifth data field and identifying a component action contained by the primary action within an action hierarchy".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "the data structure further comprises: a component action identifier stored in a fifth data field and identifying a component action contained by the primary action within an action hierarchy" (column 6, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "the data structure further comprises: a component action identifier stored in a fifth data field and identifying a component action contained by the primary action within an action hierarchy" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 47, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

the data structure is recorded in an action log and further comprising: an inactive

flag stored in a fifth data field and indicating that the primary action has been made

inactive but the data structure remains persistent in the action log. (column 6, lines 55-

60)

As per claim 48, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

the data structure further comprises: an action descriptor stored in a fifth data

field and describing the primary action. (column 4, lines 10-18).

As per claim 49, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

receiving a first log of actions from the first computer application and a second

log of actions from the second computer application, the first log of actions including

actions executed in the first computer application and the second log of actions

including actions executed in the second computer application. (column 5, lines 40-45)

As per claim 50,

<u>De Meno</u> does not explicitly indicate "at least one action in the first log of actions

has a cross-source relationship with at least one action in the second log of actions".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "at least one action in the first log of actions has a cross-source relationship with at least one action in the second log of actions" (column 6, lines 17-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of ""at least one action in the first log of actions has a cross-source relationship with at least one action in the second log of actions" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 51,

each action in the first log of actions and each action in the second log of actions includes an action identifier (column 3, lines 50-53)

for identifying the corresponding action. ('for' indicates intended use; Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

As per claim 52, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

the first log further contains a first source identifier (column 3, lines 50-53)

for identifying the first computer application ('for' indicates intended use; Minton

v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620

(Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply

expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." Examples of claim

language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of

the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein"

clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use limitations are not required

to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

and the second log further contains a second source identifier (column 3, lines

50-53)

for identifying the second computer application. ('for' indicates intended use;

Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d

1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight

when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited."

Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to

the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for "

clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use

limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP

2111.04 [R-3])

As per claim 53, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

the first source identifier and the second source identifier are different. (column 3,

lines 40-45)

As per claim 54, <u>De Meno</u> teaches

displaying a plurality of first computer application actions executed in the first

computer application, wherein the plurality of first computer application actions includes

the first action; (column 5, lines 43-46; figure 4)

displaying a plurality of action management operations wherein the plurality of

action management operations includes the first action management operation; (column

5, lines 54-60; figure 4)

receiving a selection of the first action in the plurality of first computer application

actions; (column 5, lines 54-60; figure 4)

and receiving a selection of the first action management operation in the plurality

of action management operations. (column 5, lines 54-60; figure 4)

As per claim 55,

the related action identifier for indicating a cross-source relationship between the

first action and the second action. ('for' indicates intended use; Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of

Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

"whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the

intended result of a process step positively recited." Examples of claim language,

although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP 2111.04 [R-3]).

De Meno does not explicitly indicate "identifying a cross-source relationship includes receiving a related action identifier corresponding to the first action".

However, Duparcmeur discloses "identifying a cross-source relationship includes receiving a related action identifier corresponding to the first action" (column 6, lines 24-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine De Meno and Duparcmeur because using the steps of "identifying a cross-source relationship includes receiving a related action identifier corresponding to the first action" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by maintaining integrity in an object system. This gives the user the advantage of allowing objects to interact.

As per claim 56, De Meno teaches

executing the first action management operation on the first action includes executing the selected first action management operation on the selected first action. (column 3, lines 50-60)

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11,13-18,21-24,35-36,43-56 have

been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is

considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-

7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100